

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 10-15 are pending. Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 9 and to further clarify its scope. Claim 2 was amended to conform to the amendments of claim 1. Claims 10-15 were added to further define the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1, 2 and 13, the new phrase of a “marginal region” is fully supported by at least Figs. 2A and 3A, both of which show a marginal region that includes one or more color bars pre-printed thereon. The phrase “marginal region” is used herein in accordance with its ordinary meaning to one skilled in the art.

Regarding new claims 10 and 14, Figs. 2A and 3A fully support the limitation wherein the marginal region is a minor region of the proofing paper and the blank region is a major region of the proofing paper. “Minor region” and “major region” are used herein in accordance with their ordinary meaning to one skilled in the art.

Accordingly, no new matter was added.

Request for Interview Prior to Formal Action on Amendment

Applicant requests an interview prior to formal action on this response. An “Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form” accompanies this response. Please contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to schedule the interview.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections

This rejection is believed to be moot in view of the claim amendments.

The Examiner apparently read the claims to include first and second blank regions. The amended wording makes clear that there is only one blank region. The non-blank region is the marginal region, and that region includes at least one color bar pre-printed thereon. Together, these two regions constitute the entire surface area of one side of the sheet of paper. While no definitive “boundary” is shown in the drawings between the newly claimed “marginal region”

and the blank region, Figs. 2A and 3A clearly illustrate these two regions in a manner that would be understood by one skilled in the art.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Chalmers et al. (hereafter, "Chalmers"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as it pertains to the amended claims.

1. Patentability of claims 1 and 12 over Chalmers

Claims 1 and 12 read as follows (underlining added for emphasis):

1. A sheet of paper comprising:
(a) a blank region for subsequent printing of a content image portion; and
(b) a marginal region outside of the blank region, the marginal region including one or more standard color bars pre-printed thereon, and each of the one or more standard color bars having a plurality of color blocks, each color block reflecting a wavelength in the electromagnetic spectrum that represents a color selected from a color space, wherein the blank region and the marginal region constitute the entire surface area of one side of the sheet of paper.

12. A sheet of paper comprising:
(a) a marginal region including one or more standard color bars pre-printed thereon, and each of the one or more standard color bars having a plurality of color blocks, each color block reflecting a wavelength in the electromagnetic spectrum that represents a color selected from a color space; and
(b) a blank region outside of the marginal region for subsequent printing of a content image portion, wherein the marginal region and the blank region constitute the entire surface area of one side of the sheet of paper.

In the outstanding rejection, the Examiner states that the claimed "blank region" is met by the region to the right of the "lady image" 2 in FIG. 1 of Chalmers, and the region outside of the blank region and having color bars is met by the color blocks 1 shown in FIG. 1 of Chalmers.

In response, none of the color blocks 1 of Chalmers are in marginal regions of the Chalmers sheet. Furthermore, even if it could be argued that at least one of the color blocks 1 of Chalmers is in a marginal region of the Chalmers sheet, the marginal region and the blank region of Chalmers, as defined by the Examiner, do not constitute the “entire surface area” of one side of the sheet shown in FIG. 1 of Chalmers because there are many other regions in the Chalmers sheet of paper that have either images or blank areas. Nor is there any other combination of marginal regions and blank regions in Chalmers that, together, would constitute the “entire surface area” of one side of the sheet.

For at least these reasons, amended claims 1 and 12 are believed to be patentable over Chalmers.

3. Patentability of dependent claims

The dependent claims are believed to be patentable over the applied references for at least the reason that they are dependent upon allowable base claims and because they recite additional patentable elements and steps.

Claims 10 and 14 are further believed to be patentable over Chalmers because the region of Chalmers that includes the color blocks 1 is not a minor region of the Chalmers sheet, and the region of Chalmers that the Examiner defined as the “blank region,” namely, the region to the right of the “lady image” 2 in FIG. 1 of Chalmers, is not a major region of the Chalmers sheet.

Claims 11 and 15 are further believed to be patentable over Chalmers because the Chalmers sheet is not proofing paper. The process described in Chalmers was summarized in the Petition to Make Special filed in the parent Application No. 10/192,404. The discussion is repeated below for convenience.

U.S. Patent No. 5,953,990 (Chalmers et al.) discloses a process for calibrating color printing in a printing engine. The process uses a master sheet and a test sheet. The master sheet has a first array of desired colors thereon. The test sheet has a second array of the desired colors thereon. The second array is offset from the first array so that when the first and second arrays are aligned, each of the desired colors of the first array is immediately adjacent to the same desired color of the second array. A printing engine prints an image of the master sheet on the test sheet. Then, the colors of the printed image of the master sheet's first

array that appear on the test sheet are compared with the corresponding desired colors of the test sheet's second array that are immediately adjacent thereto. The printing engine is then adjusted based on the comparison. This process does not perform the combination of steps underlined above.

There is no use of a proof in Chalmers. The process in Chalmers is used to adjust a printing engine, not to determine if a proof is made that meets industry standards. Since there is no proof used or created in Chalmers, neither the master sheet nor the test sheet (with or without the master sheet image printed thereon) are proofing paper. Thus, no "proofing paper" is provided in Chalmers, as required by the present claims.

Stated simply, FIG. 1 of Chalmers merely shows a reference image that is to be printed as part of the calibration process. The reference image in FIG. 1 includes both color bars 1 and color pictures 2. FIG. 1 is not a sheet of proofing paper.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections were fully addressed, the instant application is in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowability of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark A. Weiss



CLARK A. JABLON

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 35,039

Direct Dial: (215) 965-1293

E-Mail: cjablon@panitchlaw.com

February 8, 2008
(Date)

Panitch Schwarze Belisario & Nadel LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone No.: 215-965-1330
Fax No.: 215-965-1331